

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6 and 9-17 are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 4 and 6, the independent claims, have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention, in terms which distinguish over the art of record..

Claims 1, 3-6 and 9-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious from U.S. Patent 4,902,881 (Janku) in view of German Patent 3011511 (Siemens) and U.S. Patent 4,885,771 (Rabideau et al.), and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

First, the typographical error in Claim 1 has been corrected, and all the claims have been carefully reviewed to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph. It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The present invention as defined in independent Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an information processing apparatus. This apparatus comprises (1) means for reading image information containing character data including a name and a phone number recorded on a recording medium, (2) image memory means for storing image information, (3) means for recognizing a character train included in the read image information, and a (4) means for extracting the name and the phone number from the character train.

Thus, one important feature of an apparatus constructed according to Claim 1 is that the apparatus extracts the name and phone number from a character train printed on a recording medium. Similarly, independent Claims 4 and 6 are each directed to an information processing apparatus which discriminates a name and phone number from a character train (and further include a means for transmission of a document based upon the phone number).

As understood by Applicants, the cited reference Janku teaches a communication terminal that, inter alia, provides facsimile transmission and document storage. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Janku fails to teach a "means for recognizing image data, means for registering the image data using a memory control means,..." (Paper No. 39, page 2, last paragraph). As understood by Applicants, the cited reference Rabideau et al. teaches an information storage system of telephone numbers which utilizes "operator input keys" as the input means (Abstract) and consequently also fails to teach any means for recognizing image data. Thus, neither of these cited references teaches or suggests the claimed feature of the Applicants' independent claims that the claimed apparatus extracts the name and phone number from image information recorded on a recording medium.

The cited reference Siemens relates to a telephone handset having a reader device. By placing this reader device directly above a printed phone number, the reader

device reads this phone number. As understood by Applicants, Siemens requires that the number being read be stored in "an optical number code" (Abstract, line 2). Siemens, however, also fails to teach the extracting means or pick-up means of the Applicants' independent claims by which a phone number is extracted from a character train of image information. For Siemens to teach or suggest this claim feature, his reading device would have to teach reading an unencoded phone number from a printed sheet containing extraneous numbers and characters. The Examiner argues that since "[t]he recognition of alphabets by optical readers is well known and widely used ..." (page 4, lines 1-3), it would be obvious to provide Siemens with "optical character recognition (OCR) abilities in order to easily program the telephone numbers and their associated names into the device" (page 4, lines 6-11). Applicants maintain that even if the combination of the teachings of Siemens and the OCR art is deemed to teach reading character data using a specially equipped handset, the combination still fails to teach extracting phone numbers from a character train of image information, for the following reasons.

As understood by Applicants, Siemens teaches scanning a number code by manually positioning an opto-electric reading eye above said code. The recitations in the independent claims state that the apparatus comprises an "extracting means" (Claim 1) or alternatively, a "pick-up

means" (Claims 4 and 6), whereby the name and phone number are recognized from a character train contained in recorded image data. The combination of Siemens with an OCR does not teach the claimed invention. Siemens requires an operator to manually select the optical number code to be inputted. Applicants maintain the combination of Siemens with an OCR would teach entry of a telephone number by optically scanning image data once the operator has manually selected the number to be entered. Thus, the combination would still fail to teach an "extracting means" (in the language of Claim 1) or a "pick-up means" (in the language of claims 4 and 6,) which, prior to any optical scanning, identifies where the phone number is located within the image data. Thus, even if Siemens and an OCR are combined with Janku and Rabideau et al. as proposed in the Office Action, the result would fail to meet the terms of the independent claims.

For at least these reasons, Claims 1, 4 and 6 are deemed clearly patentable over the cited combination of Janku, Siemens, and Rabideau et al.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims

discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.


In view of the fact that the only amendments to the claims have been to define more clearly the present invention, Applicants submit that the claims do not raise new issues that would require further search or consideration. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. At the very least, however, it is believed that the formal rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 758-2400 or by facsimile at (212) 758-2982. All correspondence should

continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29,286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
277 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10172
Facsimile: (212) 758-2982